Guidelines for teacher candidates

All teacher candidates are required to design and implement innovative units in their student teaching and/or practicum experiences. As in the case of lesson plans, we believe it is important in at least one case to make explicit your thinking processes about design, implementation, and assessment. The following guidelines explain the minimum required components we expect in innovative unit papers. This assessment, in conjunction with final student teaching evaluations, will determine if a candidate will “pass” student teaching. Assessment of the continuous teaching cycle will occur on two levels: 1) Candidate ability to design, implement, and analyze the unit as described in these guidelines, and 2) Candidate ability to address in the unit the relevant standards set by their professional organization and Warner School proficiencies. The rubric is divided into three parts and is included in this packet. Content area faculty may provide additional rubrics specific to that specialization.

**Inclusion candidates:** Connected to your content area Innovative Unit Plan, you will implement a Continuous Teaching Cycle (CTC), to document how you utilize assessments to both inform and revise instruction. This is designed to support candidates to provide evidence of their ability to facilitate learning, be reflective practitioners who use assessment to inform instruction, and thoughtfully and systematically consider the impact of their instruction on P-12 students. The CTC guidelines follow the assignment rubric

Required Unit Components:

1. **Introduction:** This section should provide a brief description of the unit that gives a context for the components of the unit, including an essential question and/or topic addressed if appropriate. Include a clear description of the context of implementation for the unit, including grade level, racial, ethnic and gender make-up of students and teachers, a description of the school and classroom, and whether the implementation occurred in the first or second student teaching/practicum experience. **Inclusion candidates:** See the Learning Environment Context guidelines. (CEC 2, 3, 6)

2. **Theoretical framework:** Provide a clear, well thought out theoretical framework that both guides and provides a foundation for the unit, using course readings (and outside readings where appropriate). Candidates should state their definition of the content area addressed and their theory of learning. In other words, how does your definition of [literacy, language, science, math, English, social studies] and theory of learning frame the unit? This section should also include a clear rationale for the unit (e.g. why is this unit important? Why will student learning be meaningful and relevant in this unit?). **Inclusion candidates:** The theoretical framework should also address your definition of / theoretical approach towards inclusive practice (using outside readings where appropriate). Include a clear theoretical rationale for the instructional strategies you will employ during the unit. (CEC 3, 6)

3. **Goals/Professional standards:** Describe the overarching goal/s of the unit and connect the goal/s to the larger curriculum in your class (e.g. an integrated curriculum in elementary or the specific content area in secondary). Discuss the professional and/or state standards this unit addresses. Make explicit the specific content addressed and connections to the theoretical framework, curriculum, and overarching unit goal/s. (CEC 1, 3, 4, 5)
4. Objectives: Clearly articulate the specific unit objectives and connect these objectives to the unit goals and professional standards. **Inclusion candidates:** In addition, describe how the goals / objectives for the unit consider students’ working towards accomplishing their IEP goals and objectives. (CEC 1, 3, 4, 5)

5. Assessment of student learning over time: Describe the multiple forms of assessment used across the unit. Include formative, summative, formal, and informal assessments. Explicitly connect your assessment to the theoretical framework, unit goals and objectives, and professional standards. In other words, how will your assessments help you scaffold student learning over time and how will you know you have accomplished your goals? How will your assessments inform instruction? **Inclusion candidates:** See the CTC Assessment Plan guidelines. In addition, describe the ways that the assessment will be differentiated, adapted, accommodated, and/or modified to address the strengths, interests, and diverse learning needs of all students, including English Language Learners and students with disability labels. Include pre- and post-tests. During this unit, you will identify 3 students (at least 2 of whom must have IEPs), demonstrating low, average, and high scores on their pre-assessments and on the post-assessments after lesson implementation. The Inclusion candidate will implement a well-planned CTC during which you plan and teach according to individual student needs based on an analysis of student work samples collected throughout the implementation of the unit plan. (CEC 4)

6. Pedagogy: Describe the series of connected lessons and/or experiences in the unit. Include your detailed lesson plans for selected lessons in this section using the lesson plan format given to you. Describe in detail how you will scaffold and support student learning over time and address any relevant safety considerations. **Inclusion candidates:** See CTC Pedagogy guidelines. In addition, describe how the lesson activities and strategies are differentiated through multiple means of representation, expression, and engagement that reflect high, appropriate expectations for all students, including English Language Learners and students with disabilities, (2) how accommodations and/or modifications and student language and communication needs indicated on IEP are incorporated into the lessons, and (3) how you collaborated with related services and para-professionals to meet IEP goals. (CEC 1, 2, 3, 5, 7)

7. Unit implementation: Describe what happened when you implemented this unit, with particular attention to students’ responses to its main activities. Reflect on what went well and what you would change in future implementations. **Inclusion candidates:** See the Unit Implementation Reflection guidelines. As part of the CTC, describe how you planned and revised your instruction based on student strengths, interests, needs, and performance and your assessment of the effectiveness of your instruction in previous lessons, highlighting in particular the 3 selected students. (CEC 6)

8. Analysis of student learning: Report the results of a systematic analysis of what your students learned as a result of the unit, making explicit references to goals and objectives, and using data from formal assessments and classroom observations (see number 5 above). Refer as appropriate to the assessment results and student work in an appendix to support your claims. **Inclusion candidates:** See the Analysis of Student Learning guidelines. (CEC 2, 4, 6)

9. Unit analysis: This section is a detailed analysis of the implementation of the unit that brings together content, theory, and practice. Describe how you have integrated the components of the unit into a coherent whole that produces meaningful and relevant student learning and addresses the goals articulated in Part 2 and 3 of the rubric. Connect the unit implementation with the larger curriculum and theoretical framework described in the introduction. **Inclusion candidates:** See Unit Analysis guidelines. In addition, make connections to inclusive practice. (CEC 6)
10. **Appendix:** Include: 1) text of key assignments and assessments, including rubrics or handouts given to students; 2) aggregate assessment data; 3) samples of student work with your comments.

What follows are the rubrics that will be used to evaluate this major assessment. You are expected to provide a self-evaluation of your work using these rubrics; your methods course instructor will do the same independently.
Scoring guidelines and rubrics

There are three parts to this evaluation:

**Part I:** Designed to evaluate the extent to which the candidate has fulfilled the requirements of this project, as outlined in the detailed description of the assignment. Failing to do so may require the candidate to revise or redo the assignment before he/she can pass the course.

**Part II:** Designed to evaluate the extent to which the candidate has met some key standards about planning and implementing instruction set by his/her professional organization.

**Part III:** Designed to evaluate the extent to which the candidate has met some key proficiencies identified as target for all Warner teacher candidates.

Please remember to complete all three parts. Each part has different rubrics, so please carefully review the instructions provided at the beginning of each part before scoring.

We expect both the candidate and the instructor to independently complete this evaluation.

**Inclusion candidates:** Please note that for the CTC, you will be assessed on Parts I and II with a revised rubric that incorporates the requirements of the project and the CEC professional organization standards into ONE rubric. Thus, the student and instructor will complete two rubrics to evaluate this assignment instead of three.
CONTINUOUS TEACHING CYCLE EVALUATION FORM

Candidate’s name: ____________________________ Evaluator’s name: ____________________________
Evaluator’s role: __ cooperating teacher; __ university supervisor; __ faculty advisor
Student teaching experience: __ first __ second Semester: ____________________________ Course # ____________

Parts I and II: Common Rubric that incorporates CEC standards for INCLUSION teacher candidates

Based on the Continuous Teaching Cycle submitted and using the following rubric, evaluate the extent to which the candidate provided evidence of meeting the assignment criteria and the specific CEC standards incorporated into the rubric:

1. Unacceptable/Insufficient: The criteria described are not met. In order to obtain a passing grade in this assignment, the candidate must redo all or part of the Continuous Teaching Cycle as directed by the course professor.
2. Needs improvement/Emerging: The criteria described are partially met. Minor revisions in the paper are called for to address the shortcomings identified and should be completed before the candidate can “pass” this assignment.
3. Basic proficiency: The criteria described are essentially met. The Continuous Teaching Cycle report can be used as evidence that the candidate is able to plan, implement and evaluate worthwhile and innovative instructional units.
4. Outstanding performance: The unit Continuous Teaching Cycle meets the criteria described and provides an outstanding example that the candidate is able to plan, implement and evaluate worthwhile and innovative instructional units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>(1) Unacceptable/Insufficient</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement/Emerging</th>
<th>(3) Basic Proficiency</th>
<th>(4) Outstanding Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student Learning Environment CEC 1, 2, 6 (Section 1 of guidelines)</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrates minimal or no knowledge of characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning and minimal or no understanding and value of the importance and complex characteristics of families of students with ELN; demonstrates minimal, stereotypical, irrelevant, or no knowledge of ELN student diversity and differences (e.g., developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests); identifies the value of understanding students’ skills and prior learning, but identifies no implications of this information for planning and assessment based on student individual differences and learning environment characteristics</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrates some knowledge of characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning and some understanding and value of the importance and complex characteristics of families of students with ELN; demonstrates general knowledge of ELN student diversity and differences (e.g., developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests); identifies the value of understanding students’ skills and prior learning, and identifies general implications of this information for planning and assessment based on student individual differences and learning environment</td>
<td>Candidate articulates a comprehensive understanding of characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning and a good understanding and value of the importance and complex characteristics of families of students with ELN; displays specific knowledge of ELN student diversity and differences (e.g., developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests); demonstrates knowledge of students’ skills and prior learning, and identifies specific implications of this information for planning and assessment based on student individual differences and learning environment characteristics</td>
<td>Candidate articulates an in-depth understanding of characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning with specific data, cited sources, and/or statistics; candidate understands and values the importance and complex characteristics of families of students with ELN; articulates in-depth knowledge of ELN student diversity and differences (e.g., developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests); demonstrates an in-depth knowledge of students’ skills and prior learning and articulates the implications of this information for planning and assessment through an analysis of decisions for instruction based on student individual differences and learning environment characteristics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Self Score | Faculty Score |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>(1) Unacceptable/Insufficient</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement/Emerging</th>
<th>(3) Basic Proficiency</th>
<th>(4) Outstanding Performance</th>
<th>Self Score</th>
<th>Faculty Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Theoretical Framework CEC 4, 6 (Section 2 of guidelines)</td>
<td>Candidate does not articulate a theoretical framework or adequately use course readings. Candidate does not provide a definition of the content area and theory of learning clearly and demonstrates little evidence of an understanding of theory and research relevant to special education and how this influences instructional design. Candidate does not or does not clearly state the rationale for the unit or articulate the importance of the unit to meaningful and relevant student learning and inclusive practice.</td>
<td>Candidate somewhat articulates a theoretical framework and uses some course readings where appropriate. Candidate provides a definition of the content area and theory of learning but does not clearly demonstrate evidence of an understanding of theory and research related to special education and how this influences instructional design. Candidate does not or does not clearly state the rationale for the unit, but minimally articulates the importance of the unit to meaningful and relevant student learning and inclusive practice.</td>
<td>Candidate sufficiently articulates a theoretical framework that guides and provides a foundation for the unit and uses course readings where appropriate. Candidate provides a definition of the content area and a theory of learning and demonstrates evidence of understanding of evidence-based principles and theories related to special education and how these influence their design of assessment, instructional planning, and implementation. Candidate states the rationale for the unit and sufficiently articulates the importance of the unit to meaningful and relevant student learning and inclusive practice.</td>
<td>Candidate clearly and thoughtfully articulates a theoretical framework that clearly guides and provides a foundation for the unit. Candidate uses course readings and outside readings where appropriate. Candidate provides a definition of the content area and a theory of learning and demonstrates superior evidence of understanding of philosophies, evidence-based principles and theories relevant to special education and how these influence their design of assessment, instructional planning, and implementation. Candidate states the rationale for the unit and clearly articulates the importance of the unit to meaningful and relevant student learning and inclusive practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lesson Planning to Meet District/state Requirements CEC 1, 3, 5 (Sections 3 and 4 of guidelines)</td>
<td>Candidate constructs lesson plans that do not contain the essential components of an effective lesson plan, with no evidence or vague reference to NYS standards and no or vague, inappropriate, or unrealistic goals and objectives that reflect only one level of learning and do not address goals/objectives from IEPs</td>
<td>Candidate constructs lesson plans that demonstrate knowledge of content area, incorporate NYS standards, but goals and objectives are not developmentally appropriate or appropriately challenging and do not address pre-requisite knowledge, skills, and other student needs, reflect only one level of learning, and minimally address goals/objectives from IEPs</td>
<td>Candidate constructs effective lesson plans that demonstrate knowledge of content area, incorporate NYS standards, developmentally appropriate and appropriately challenging goals and objectives that address pre-requisite knowledge, skills, and other student needs, reflect 3 levels of learning, and address goals/objectives from IEPs</td>
<td>Candidate constructs well written, creative, and effective lesson plans that demonstrate knowledge of content area, incorporate NYS standards, appropriately challenging goals and objectives that demonstrate realistic expectations for all students, provide for critical thinking and reflection, reflect 3 or more levels of learning, and fully address goals/objectives from IEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Assessment Plan CEC 4 (Section 5 of guidelines)</td>
<td>Candidate minimally or does not link assessment criteria to learning goals and designs an assessment plan that uses only one assessment mode, displays limited knowledge of formal/informal assessments, is not differentiated or varied to meet the individual needs of students, and includes pre- and post-assessments from 3 levels of learning, but with no reflection of student progress</td>
<td>Candidate links assessment criteria to some learning goals and designs an assessment plan that uses multiple assessment modes to document student performance, but the modes are not performance based and/or do not require integration of knowledge, skills, and critical thinking, but are differentiated, and varied to meet the individual needs of some students, and includes pre- and post-assessments from 3 levels of learning with brief reflection of student progress</td>
<td>Candidate links assessment criteria to learning goals and designs an assessment plan that uses pre-/post-, multiple, differentiated, and varied assessment modes to document student performance, strengths and needs, and effectiveness of instruction to meet the individual needs of most students, and includes pre- and post-assessments from 3 levels of learning with reflection on student progress and additional instructional strategies</td>
<td>Candidate clearly links assessment criteria to learning goals and designs an assessment plan that uses pre-/post-, multiple, differentiated, and varied formal/informal, and self-assessments to document student performance, all strengths and needs, effectiveness of instruction, are creative and show evidence of problem-solving skills, and include pre- and post-assessments from 3 levels of learning with reflection on student progress and additional instructional strategies that may be needed to master lesson content for individuals or groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>(1) Unacceptable/Insufficient</td>
<td>(2) Needs Improvement/Emerging</td>
<td>(3) Basic Proficiency</td>
<td>(4) Outstanding Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Pedagogy</td>
<td>Candidate designs lesson plans that provide little or no adjustment for individual learning needs, are not linked to learning goals, and provide no levels of support appropriate to the individual (developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests). Candidate designs activities and assignments that are not appropriate for each student, have minimal or no connections to previous lessons, do not incorporate technology, and do not describe collaboration with other school professionals</td>
<td>Candidate designs lesson plans that provide some adjustment for individual learning needs through differentiation, are not linked to all learning goals, and provide minimal levels of support appropriate to the individual (developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests). Candidate designs activities and assignments that are not appropriate for each student, have minimal connections to previous lessons, incorporate technology, but is inappropriate, and minimally describe collaboration with other school professionals</td>
<td>Candidate designs lesson plans that incorporate student interests and previous knowledge while adjusting for individual learning needs through differentiation, are linked to learning goals, and provide levels of support appropriate to the individual (developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests). Candidate designs activities and assignments using research-based instructional strategies (adaptation, UDL), have connections to previous lessons, incorporate technology and/or appropriate materials to provide opportunities for critical thinking, and generally describes collaboration with other school professionals</td>
<td>Candidate designs lesson plans that incorporate student interests and previous knowledge while adjusting for individual learning needs through differentiation, are explicitly linked to learning goals, demonstrate critical thinking and reflection in activities and assignments, and provide levels of support appropriate to the individual (developmental, cultural, linguistic, communication, behavioral, academic, and interests). Candidate designs activities and assignments using research-based instructional strategies (accommodations, modifications, adaptation, UDL), have clear connections to previous lessons, incorporate technology and/or appropriate materials to promote critical thinking and reflection, and specifically describes collaboration with other school professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Analysis of Student Learning</td>
<td>Candidate does not use assessment data to monitor and document student progress, provides minimal or no summary of the 3 students’ performance after instruction to compare pre/- post- results and minimal or no analysis of whole class that fails to include evidence of impact on student learning, achievement, and progress</td>
<td>Candidate minimally uses assessment data to monitor and document student progress, summarizes the 3 students’ performance after instruction to compare pre/- post-results, analyzes whole class but fails to include evidence of impact on student learning, achievement, and progress, but provides no visuals to support narrative summaries</td>
<td>Candidate uses assessment data to monitor and document student progress, accurately summarizes the 3 students’ performance after instruction to compare pre/- post-results, analyzes whole class learning, achievement, and progress, and provides visual and narrative summaries to demonstrate the extent of student progress</td>
<td>Candidate uses assessment data to monitor and document student progress, accurately summarizes the 3 students’ performance after instruction to compare pre/- post-results, thoroughly analyzes of whole class learning, achievement, and progress, provides implications for further instruction, and provides visual and narrative summaries that demonstrate the extent of student progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Reflection</td>
<td>Candidate reflects on but minimally probes unit outcomes and tends to blame learning outcomes on student’s lack of preparedness and understanding of previous content; candidate demonstrates minimal insight into his/her role in improving instruction but does not connect IEP goals, learning goals and objectives, instruction, and assessment data in discussion of student learning and effective instruction; provides no ideas for redesigning goals, instruction, and assessment; does not describe how the unit addresses student diversity and how all activities/strategies support the inclusion of all students</td>
<td>Candidate reflects on and vaguely probes unit outcomes and minimally reflects on performance and changes/revisions to improve instruction; candidate connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment data in a discussion of student learning and effective instruction, but does not incorporate technology and effective instruction; provides no ideas for redesigning goals, instruction, and assessment; and minimally describes how the unit addresses student diversity and how all activities/strategies support the inclusion of all students</td>
<td>Candidate reflects on and probes unit outcomes including timing, instructional strategies, use of groupings and effectiveness of technology/materials; candidate reflects on performance and changes/revisions to improve instruction, including specific strategies that may improve outcomes for individuals and the whole class and connects IEP goals, learning goals and objectives, assessment and assessment data in a discussion of student learning and effective instruction; provides implications for future teaching, including ideas for redesigning goals, instruction, and assessment and describes how the unit addresses student diversity and how all activities/strategies support</td>
<td>Candidate thoughtfully reflects on and probes unit outcomes including timing, the instructional strategies, use of groupings and effectiveness of technology/materials; candidate reflects on performance and changes/revisions to improve instruction, including specific strategies that may improve outcomes for individuals and the whole class and connects IEP goals, learning goals and objectives, instruction, and assessment data in a discussion of student learning and effective instruction, including exploring multiple hypotheses for why some students did and others did not meet learning goals, including the 3 target students; provides implications for future teaching, including specific alternative actions for redesigning goals,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. References and Citations</td>
<td>Candidate does not use proper APA format for citations</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrates many errors in proper APA format</td>
<td>Candidate makes some errors in proper APA format</td>
<td>Candidate uses proper APA format for all citations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mechanics and Usage CEC: 6</td>
<td>Candidate makes more than 12 errors in mechanics and/or usage</td>
<td>Candidate makes 8–12 errors in mechanics and/or usage</td>
<td>Candidate makes 5–7 errors in mechanics and/or usage</td>
<td>Candidate makes 0–4 errors in mechanics and/or usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from the University of South Florida, Department of Special Education and the Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project, http://www.uni.edu/it
WARNER INNOVATIVE UNIT EVALUATION FORM

Candidate’s name: ____________________  Evaluator’s name: ____________________
Evaluator’s role: __ cooperating teacher; __ university supervisor; __ faculty advisor
Student teaching experience: __ first; __ second
Semester: ____________________  Course # ________________

CTC/INNOVATIVE UNIT RUBRICS PART III: Warner proficiencies for all teacher candidates

Please evaluate the extent to which the unit plan and its implementation provides evidence that the candidate has achieved the following proficiencies set by the Warner School as targets for all candidates, using the following rubrics:

1. **Insufficient** – i.e., this proficiency was not met.
2. **Emergent/needs improvement** – i.e., you found some evidence that the candidate demonstrated this proficiency, but it was only partial or inconsistent.
3. **Basic proficiency** – i.e., you found evidence that the candidate demonstrated this proficiency at the minimum acceptable level.
4. **Outstanding performance** – i.e., the unit provided an excellent example that the candidate achieved proficiency in this area.

We realize that in some cases you may not have had the opportunity to gather pertinent information for all proficiencies listed below. Therefore, we have given the option, whenever appropriate, to indicate “n/o” (“not observed”) to clearly distinguish this situation from the one where you had the opportunity to observe relevant behavior and found it lacking. There are some proficiencies, however, for which this is not an option since, your evaluation is critical to assessing the candidate on that particular dimension – as indicated by a shaded cell corresponding to the “n/o” option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Warner School proficiencies as they could be observed in the unit:</th>
<th>n/o</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(WS 1.2) The design of the unit reflects a good understanding of the key concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the subject matter(s) addressed in the unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 1.3) The goals set for the unit and their discussion address some important principles and concepts delineated in professional, New York State, and Warner School Teaching and Curriculum standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 1.4) The unit included learning experiences that made the subject matter meaningful and relevant for all students in the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 2.2) The unit design and its analysis demonstrate that the candidate understands that all students construct knowledge through active engagement in culturally valued activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 2.3) The unit included learning experiences that took into consideration the students’ developmental level and drew on the strengths and resources available in students’ prior experiences, as well as the school, family, and community contexts in which they live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 3.4) The unit included learning experiences that were culturally relevant and addressed the strengths and needs of all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 4.2) The design and implementation of the unit included a selection or innovative teaching and learning strategies and classroom structures, appropriate to achieving the learning goals set for this unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WS 4.4) The unit took advantage of the potential of technology to support student learning, as appropriate to the goals set for the students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(WS 5.3) The activities in the unit and the classroom environment fostered student motivation and learning and the creation of a “community of learners.”

(WS 6.3) The design and implementation of the unit employed appropriate and effective modes of communication to make the ideas accessible to all students and foster inquiry.

(WS 6.4) The unit activities incorporated oral, written, visual, and electronic texts as appropriate to facilitate interaction and communication, and provide support for all students’ critical analysis of such texts.

(WS 7.1) The unit’s activities are appropriate to pursue the learning goals identified (which in turn are consistent with professional and New York State standards).

(WS 7.2) The unit has a well-defined and high quality plan, which was adequately implemented with appropriate modifications as suggested by the feedback received during the implementation.

(WS 8.2) Appropriate assessment and evaluation strategies were used to monitor, assess and provide guidance to student learning, including some that are embedded in authentic learning activities and have real audiences and purposes.

(WS 8.3) The candidate was able to use assessment data to inform instruction by making explicit links in the unit analysis between his/her teaching and student performance, and by either making immediate adjustments in the unit or suggesting changes for future implementations.

(WS 8.4) Positive effect on the students’ learning is demonstrated through the aggregated data and samples of student work included in the unit report.

(WS 8.4) Appropriate assessment and evaluation strategies were used to monitor, assess and provide guidance to student learning, including some that are embedded in authentic learning activities and have real audiences and purposes.

(WS 9.2) The unit analysis demonstrates the candidate’s ability to reflect on his/her practices, constructively use critiques of his/her practice, and draw from theories and research results, in order to make necessary adjustments to enhance student learning.

(WS 10.1) The unit design sought out and built on parental and community involvement as appropriate.

**Comments:**
Continuous Teaching Cycle Guidelines
(Inclusion Innovative Unit)

Adapted from the Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project,
http://www.uni.edu/itq/
Introduction / Learning Environment Contexts Guidelines

This section should provide a brief description of the unit that gives a context for the components of the unit, including an essential question and or/topic addressed if appropriate. Include a clear description of the context of implementation for the unit. Please use the following list to collect information about the potentially relevant contextual factors of the learning environment of your placement. You should only address the factors that directly impact your teaching and student learning and how these factors impact the teaching of your unit plan and your student learning. This list is not exhaustive; rather, it provides suggestions to help you describe the context of the school, classroom, and students. This information should be incorporated into your narrative for the Introduction section of your CTC/Innovative Unit. Target students: In this section, you should also identify (using pseudonyms) and sketch the three target students for this unit: three students who are performing at, above, and below grade level, at least two of whom must have IEPs and receive special education services. You will follow these students closely during the implementation of your CTC/Innovative Unit.

Community, School System, and School Factors
Geographic Location
• Rural/ Urban
• Describe the unique features of community
• Describe the contributions of community to school

School System
• Name of school system (please provide a pseudonym)
• Number of students in school system
• Number of students in school system on free or reduced lunch
• Has the district met AYP? Any other school report card data about the district?

School (please see the New York State School Report Card at http://emsc33.nysed.gov/irts/reportcard/)
• Name of school (please provide a pseudonym)
• Grades served
• Student enrollment
• Has the school met AYP? Any other school report card data about the school?

Classroom Characteristics
Students
• Number of boys / girls
• Age range
• Ethnicity (give numbers)
• Socio-Economic profile (% Students in classroom on free or reduced lunch)

Reading Achievement
• Based on: _________________________
  o % above average or advanced skill level
  o % average or intermediate level
  o % below average skill level
Mathematics Achievement

- Based on:
  - % above average or advanced skill level
  - % average or intermediate level
  - % below average skill level

Classroom Organization

- Homogeneous
- Heterogeneous
- Self-Contained
- Team Teaching
- Departmentalized
- Parallel Block
- Other programs

Resources

- Television
- Classroom library (estimate number of books)
- Number of computers in classroom
- SMART Board/Interactive whiteboard
- Other resources (such as math and science manipulative materials)

**Individual Differences**

Students Attending Pull-Out (or Push-In) or Supplementary Programs

- Title I
- Reading
- Gifted
- Early Intervention Program
- Safety Net
- Other programs (including therapies)

Language Proficiency

- English Language
- Bilingual
- Other Languages

Students with IEPs

- IEP review: Identify students’ strengths and needs

Other student factors

- Culture
- Interests
- Learning styles / modalities
- Skill levels and prior learning on lesson subject

**Instructional Implications**

- Address how you will use this information in the development of your learning goals, instructional planning, and assessment in the unit.
Assessment Plan Guidelines

In the **Assessment of Student Learning Over Time** section of your CTC/Innovative Unit, you must describe your design of an assessment plan used to monitor student progress toward the learning goals. Describe the multiple forms of assessment used across the unit. Include formative, summative, formal, and informal assessments. Explicitly connect your assessment to the theoretical framework, unit goals and objectives, and professional standards. You should include assessment measures for assessing student content understanding before instruction (pre-assessments), during instruction, and after instruction (post- or summative assessments). These assessments should correlate to the developmental levels and individual needs of all students in your classroom, reflect sound practice with clear, high expectations for performance, and authentically measure student learning. How will your assessments help you scaffold student learning over time and how will you know you have accomplished your goals? How will your assessments inform instruction? Please summarize your plan in a chart. Your chart should list each goal; the assessment(s) used to describe student performance and criteria for satisfactory performance; and any differentiation, adaptations, accommodations, and/or modifications used to address the individual differences and special needs of the students in your classroom. In your narrative, you should provide a rationale for each assessment that explains why you chose or developed the assessment. You should plan to provide multiple examples from your target students to include in your **Analysis of Student Learning** section.

Your assessment plan must include:

- An overview of the assessment plan in chart format (sample chart found at the end of these guidelines): For each learning goal include  
  - Assessments used to measure student performance  
  - The format of each assessment  
  - Differentiation, adaptations, accommodations and/or modifications of the assessments for the individual needs of students based on pre-assessment and learning environment contextual factors  
- In your narrative, discuss the assessments that are aligned with your learning goals. Clearly explain how you will evaluate or score pre- and post-assessments, including criteria you will use to determine if the students’ performance meets the learning goals. Include copies of assessments, prompts, and/or student directions and criteria for judging student performance (e.g., scoring rubrics, observation checklist, rating scales, item weights, test blueprint, answer key).  
- Discuss your plan for formative assessment that will help you determine student progress during the unit. Describe the assessments you plan to use to check on student progress and comment on the importance of collecting that particular evidence. Although formative assessment may change as you are teaching the unit, your task here is to predict at what points in your teaching it will be important to assess students’ progress toward learning goals.  
- You must include copies (in an appendix or in your lesson plans) of the assessments and/or prompts and student directions for the assessments for each entry in the table.
• In your narrative, identify and describe in-depth **two assessments** that you intend to collect from your students and analyze as evidence of student achievement. You should plan to record scores on pre- and post-tests from at least one class (minimum of 15-20 students) to make reasonable inferences about student learning. You must collect data on your three target students.
  o One assessment must be a pre-and post-assessment of student learning relative to one of your content objectives.
  o The other assessment should measure performance on one of your higher-order thinking skill objectives. Give a brief rationale for why you chose this second assessment.

**Sample Assessment Plan Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Format of Assessment</th>
<th>Adaptations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 1</td>
<td>Pre-Assessment</td>
<td>Bell ringer: describe the rate of change of a quadratic model based on predictions using the quadratic model equation</td>
<td>Provide more time. Guide students with questions. Sketch graph on the board. Allow students to complete the bell ringer as a group. Pair high achieving students with low achieving students. Provide help for writing. Typed response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formative Assessment</td>
<td>Calculator activities, worksheets, LearningCheck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 2</td>
<td>Pre-Assessment</td>
<td>Bell ringer: What is the importance of limiting factors on a population? Tor F: Logistic growth occurs when the population’s growth slows or stops following exponential growth, at the population’s carrying capacity.</td>
<td>Provide verbal cues and extra time as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formative Assessment</td>
<td>Virtual Lab: How does competition affect population growth? Students will conduct an experiment and grow two species of the protozoan Paramecium, alone and together. They will then</td>
<td>Allow some students that need extra help to pair up with a classmate. On task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit slip Post-lab questions and graphs. Common exam (questions: 1-10, ORQ 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Goal 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pre-assessment</strong></td>
<td>Bell Ringer assignment, short answer question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Formative Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Lecture notes on human population, computer lab internet activity, write in lab journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Post-assessment</strong></td>
<td>Common exam: Multiple choice and one open response question. (questions: 11-18, ORQ 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Assessment Plan chart from Hellem, S., Ping, M., & Baker, J. (n.d.).
Teacher Work Sample, University of Kentucky
Pedagogy Guidelines

Describe the series of connected lessons and/or experiences in the unit. Describe how you will design your unit instruction related to unit goals/objectives, students’ characteristics and needs, and the specific learning context. Include your detailed lesson plans for selected lessons in this section using the lesson plan format given to you. Describe in detail how you will scaffold and support student learning over time and address any relevant safety considerations. In addition, describe how the lesson activities and strategies are differentiated through multiple means of representation, expression, and engagement that reflect high, appropriate expectations for all students, including English Language Learners and students with disabilities, (2) how accommodations and/or modifications and student language and communication needs indicated on IEP are incorporated into the lessons, and (3) how you collaborated with related services and para-professionals to meet IEP goals. Specifically discuss your three target students in this section.

Include in the Pedagogy section:

- Results of pre-assessment
  - After administering the pre-assessment, analyze student performance relative to the learning goals/objectives. Depict the results of the pre-assessment in a format that allows you to find patterns of student performance relative to each learning goal/objective. You may use a table, graph, or chart.
  - Provide a narrative description of the pattern you found that guided your instruction or modification of the objectives.

- Unit overview
  - Use a visual organizer such as a block plan or outline to make your unit plan overview clear. Include the topic or activity you are planning for each day/period.
  - Also indicate the goal or goals (coded from your Goals/Professional Standards section) that you are addressing in each activity. Make sure that every goal/objective is addressed by at least one activity and that every activity relates to at least one goal/objective.

- Lesson plans
  - Provide a minimum of five lessons following the Warner School lesson plan format.
  - Indicate the learning goals/objectives that are aligned with the lesson activities in your plans. Make sure that every goal is addressed by at least one activity and that every activity relates to at least one goal.
  - Include the ways that the lesson activities and strategies are differentiated through multiple means of representation, expression, and engagement that reflect high, appropriate expectations for all students, including English Language Learners and students with disabilities.
  - Include how accommodations and/or modifications and student language and communication needs indicated on IEP are incorporated into the lessons.
  - Include information on how you collaborated with related services and para-professionals to meet IEP goals.
• Activities
  o From your lesson plans, describe at least three unit activities that reflect a variety of instructional strategies/techniques and explain why you are planning those specific activities. In your explanation for each activity, include:
    ▪ how the content relates to your instructional goal(s),
    ▪ how the activity stems from your pre-assessment information and contextual factors,
    ▪ how the activity is differentiated / adapted and includes accommodations and/or modifications to meet the instructional needs of all learners, including your three target students,
    ▪ what materials/technology you will need to implement the activity, and
    ▪ how you plan to assess student learning during and/or following the activity (i.e., formative assessment).

• Technology. Describe how you will use technology in your planning and/or instruction. If you do not plan to use any form of technology, provide your clear rationale for its omission.
Unit Implementation Reflection Guidelines

Describe what happened when you implemented this unit, with particular attention to students’ responses to its main activities. Reflect on what went well and what you would change in future implementations. Describe how you planned and revised your instruction based on student strengths, interests, needs, and performance and your assessment of the effectiveness of your instruction in previous lessons, highlighting in particular your three target students.

• Reflection
  o Provide your daily reflections about your students’ responses your instruction
  o Provide evidence of student learning
  o Include a description of how you will respond to your students’ needs through adapting / revising the next day’s lesson. You **MUST** include specific reflections for your three target students.
  o Include this reflection at the end of your lesson plan each day after teaching the lesson, as indicated on the Warner School lesson plan format.

• Provide at least two specific examples of instructional decision-making based on your target students’ learning or responses.
  o Describe the students’ learning or response that caused you to adapt or revise your original design for instruction; this may come from a planned formative assessment or another source
  o Describe what you did next and why you thought this would improve student progress toward the learning goal and/or objective
  o Cite specific evidence to support your responses
Analysis of Student Learning guidelines

Report the results of a systematic analysis of what your students learned as a result of the unit, making explicit references to goals and objectives, and using data from formal assessments and classroom observations (see the Assessment of student learning over time section). Refer as appropriate to the assessment results and student work in an appendix to support your claims. Include student work samples and any charts/graphs/tables created to support your analysis. In addition, you must provide specific analysis of the learning of your three target students. Your analysis should provide data for at least two of the learning goals/objectives addressed in your unit. You must analyze your data to report the performance of the whole class and your three target students.

• Whole Class Analysis
  o Create a table that shows pre- and post-assessment data on every student on every learning goal
  o Create a graphic summary that presents data for all students in the class to draw conclusions about the extent to which your students made progress (from pre- to post-) toward at least one content objective addressed in the unit
  o Describe and analyze student performance on one of your higher-order thinking objectives.
  o Include representative examples of student work to support your analysis.
  o Summarize what the graphs tell you about your students' learning in this unit (e.g., the number of students met the criterion).

• Target student analysis
  o Explain why it is important to understand the learning of your target students
  o Use pre-, formative, and post-assessment data with examples of student work to draw conclusions about the extent to which these students attained the two learning goals
  o Explain what the data for the target students illustrate about their learning in comparison to the whole class

• Use visual representations and narrative to communicate the performance of the whole class and the three target students.

Note: Conclusions drawn from this analysis (i.e., possible reasons for why your students learned [or did not learn]) should be provided in the Unit Analysis section.
*Unit Analysis Guidelines*

Provide a detailed analysis of the implementation of the unit that brings together content, theory, and practice. Describe how you have integrated the components of the unit into a coherent whole that produces meaningful and relevant student learning and addresses the goals articulated in Parts 2 and 3 of the rubric. Reflect on and evaluate your performance as a teacher and you’re your performance to student learning results. Connect the unit implementation with the larger curriculum and theoretical framework described in the introduction, making specific connections to special education and inclusive practice.

- Select the learning goal where your students as a whole were most successful.
  - Provide two or more possible reasons for this success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other learning environment contextual factors under your control.

- Select the learning goal where each of your target students was most successful.
  - Provide two or more possible reasons for this success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other learning environment contextual factors under your control.

- Select the learning goal where your students as a whole were least successful.
  - Provide two or more possible reasons for this lack of success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other learning environment contextual factors under your control.
  - Discuss what you could do differently or better in the future to improve your students’ performance.

- Select the learning goal where each of your target students was least successful.
  - Provide two or more possible reasons for this lack of success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other learning environment contextual factors under your control.
  - Discuss what you could do differently or better in the future to improve your students’ performance.

- Reflect on and evaluate the effectiveness of your instructional sequence and reflect on your teaching practice and its impact on student learning. It might be helpful to address the following questions:
  - Were the goals for your instructional sequence met? Provide evidence for your response.
  - How did you change your planned instructional sequence as the lessons were actually taught? Why?
  - What questions or issues does this instructional sequence reveal about your teaching or the students in your classroom?
  - Were you able to implement the principles of culturally-relevant teaching in your instructional sequence? Provide examples where you think you (1) were particularly successful and (2) could enhance this aspect of your teaching in the future.
  - What aspects of your instructional sequence were especially successful or effective? Why?
  - How might you teach this instructional sequence differently if you were to do it again? Why?